

**To:** Robert Law[rlaw@demaximis.com]  
**Cc:** Vaughn, Stephanie[Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]  
**From:** Naranjo, Eugenia  
**Sent:** Thur 4/18/2013 9:57:06 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Modeling....

Rob, we did not understand the relationship between the sediment bed and the water column data that was presented at the meeting or how this is going to be used. The meeting presentation was very general and we need to review the analysis.  
Thanks.

---

**From:** Robert Law [rlaw@demaximis.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2013 2:38 PM  
**To:** Vaughn, Stephanie  
**Cc:** Naranjo, Eugenia  
**Subject:** Re: Modeling....

Stephanie and Eugenia:

A revised Modeling Meeting Summary will be forwarded next week. The CPG can respond and better address if we understand the nature of your concerns and why in a general sense the CPG's approach is "not appropriate".

R/  
Rob  
**Robert Law, Ph.D.**  
**de maximis, inc.**  
**rlaw@demaximis.com**  
**Voice: 908-735-9315**  
**Fax: 908-735-2132**

>>> "Vaughn, Stephanie" <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov> 4/18/2013 11:03 AM >>>

Hi Rob,

We have reviewed the material you sent earlier this week and have several comments/questions/concerns. However, in order to complete our review, we need some more information, as described in the action items listed in the February 28th modeling meeting minutes:

- o The CPG will provide to EPA maps showing the polygons used to define the SWAC, including a description of the methodology.
- o CPG will provide to EPA details of analysis of water column concentrations

The level of detail provided during the meeting was not enough for us to fully understand the approach you are taking. Based on the material you have provided so far, EPA has concerns that the approach the CPG is taking is not appropriate.

As such, please send us the requested material ASAP so that we can either alleviate our concerns or advise you to adjust your approach.

Thanks,

Stephanie